

Church Union

News and Views

Organ of the Continuation Committee
of the
South India Joint Committee on Union

Vol. II

MAY 1932

No. 6

CONTENTS

	PAGE
1. EDITORIALS	201
2. ARTICLES	208
3. CLIPPINGS	235

Oxford Theological Review Vol. 1, 1932
Reply to Soph. 1932 and Nov. 1932

THE CHRISTIAN LITERATURE SOCIETY FOR INDIA

Post Box 501, Park Town, Madras
1932

THE
Christian Literature Society for India

POST BOX 501, PARK TOWN, MADRAS.

The Christian Literature Society take pleasure in announcing that the Tamil and Telugu Editions of the Scheme of Union are now available at 4 annas per copy subject to the usual 25% discount to Missionaries and Ministers. Postage extra. They also wish to announce that the Tamil and Telugu editions of the 'Scheme of Union Explained' may now be obtained at the reduced price of 2 annas a copy nett.

**SPECIAL INTERCESSION
AND
PRAYERS FOR UNITY**

Issued by the Continuation Committee

Available in English and in Tamil

Price, Rs 2-8-0 per 100

CHURCH UNION

News and Views

Editorial Board

THE LORD BISHOP OF MADRAS REV. J. S. M. HOOPER, M.A.

REV. J. J. BANNINGA, D.D.

(Managing Editor.)

Publishers

THE CHRISTIAN LITERATURE SOCIETY, PARK TOWN, MADRAS.

Vol. II

MAY 1932

No. 6

Editorials

Episcopacy : Historic versus Constitutional

It is interesting to see that as the Church Union Movement advances in ever widening circles those who begin to think about this subject travel over the same ground that was covered by others in the earlier stages of the negotiations. It is perhaps true that members of the Joint Committee and others who have been in the forefront of this movement do not have the patience they should have with those who have come more recently into the movement. That impatience will hinder rather than help the movement is certain, and consequently any such impatience should be avoided. On the other hand those who have come newly into the negotiations should not insist that all the old territory must again be travelled over in order that they may be able to understand all the principles adopted, but they too should be willing to accept what has been done in order that they may be abreast of the movement as it is progressing.

It is evident from the discussion that took place in the Laymen's Meeting in Travancore that there are still a few laymen in South India who feel that the S.I.U.C. has never accepted the term 'historic episcopate' but that it has always insisted upon the term 'constitutional episcopate' instead. The attention of such laymen should be called to the discussion that took place in the General Assembly at Bangalore in 1929

when an attempt was made to delete the word 'historic' from the Proposed Scheme. In the discussion that followed it was clearly shown that though the term 'historic' was not used in the earlier S.I.U.C. documents, the very fact that negotiations were going on with the Church of England implied that the form of episcopacy that was to be accepted was the form in its external characteristics at least which was approved by the Church of England. It was also clearly stated that no doctrinal implications were accepted and that each individual might hold what doctrinal views he wished with regard to episcopacy. The first Preliminary Report of the Joint Committee, however, contains both terms, 'historic episcopate' and 'constitutional episcopate.'

It was further shown that the very first document issued by the Committee on Union of the South India United Church, in November 1919, was a letter sent to the various Church Councils in which the difference between the 'historic episcopate' and the doctrine of 'apostolic succession' was clearly set forth and the letter showed that while accepting the term 'historic episcopate' the doctrine of 'apostolic succession' was not accepted by the S.I.U.C. It is hardly fair therefore for anyone now to say after ten years of such an understanding that the S.I.U.C. has never accepted the phrase 'historic episcopacy'. Both by implication and by direct usage that term has been approved. It is of course also a fact that in the General Assembly of 1931 the term itself together with a definition was accepted by the General Assembly. Hence the term should now be accepted and the implications should be clearly understood. While acknowledging the fact that the Church after union will be an episcopal Church we can also definitely assert that it will be a constitutional Church in which the principles both of the Presbyterian Church and of the Congregational Church will be truly represented.

Bangalore Meetings

The Joint Committee of the three Churches now negotiating for union will meet in Bangalore from June 15-18 inclusive. The first day of these meetings will be given up to a retreat in accordance with the vote of the Committee at its last meeting in Madras. The Committee then felt that it was very essential that the members of the Committee should be drawn together in the closest spiritual fellowship and that they perhaps could do greater and more fruitful work in the remaining days of their session if they had spent the first day in prayer and meditation.

Among the subjects that will come before the Committee at this session are those that remain from the previous session, viz.,—

1. The powers of the Synod after the bishops have stayed action.

[See Sec. VIII C (7).]

2. Resolution of the S. I. U. C. regarding majority action during the first 30 years.
3. The Wesleyan request regarding the position of English Churches in the united Church.
4. The Anglican request regarding an explanation of the meaning of the pledge in Section-IV B. 3.
5. Resolution 19, asking the governing bodies of the three uniting Churches to express their opinion with reference to the permissibility for presbyters to join with the bishops in the laying on of hands in the consecration of a bishop.

The S.I.U.C. has asked its Committee on Union to meet with eight co-opted members to consider further the documents that have been received from the Home Churches and the Church Councils in India with a view to seeing whether any further revision of the 'Proposed Scheme' is desirable. The S.I.U.C. has heard from the Church of Scotland, the London Missionary Society, the American Board of Boston, U. S. A., and from individuals, as well as from certain Councils in India. Their Committee will carefully consider these matters and then perhaps bring further request for revision to the Joint Committee through their representatives.

The General Council of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon had its meeting in February, 1932, and after having given general approval to the Scheme asked its Committee to present the following items to the Joint Committee:—

- (a) That the teaching office of the bishops shall be declared to include the responsibility of stating as necessity arises what the faith of the Church has always been, both in the experience of their ministry in their several dioceses and as a body in public statements issued from time to time, after consultation with the presbyters, in accordance with the rules laid down by the Synod and the Churches;
- (b) That it is one of the special functions of the presbyters to declare God's message of pardon to penitent sinners.
- (c) That the Council instructs its delegates to bring to the notice of the Joint Committee the advice of the Committee of Lambeth Conference [page 127, clause (4)] with reference to confirmation as expressing its own mind on the subject.
- (a) That this Council accepts the advice of the Lambeth Conference [pages 128-129 (4), (a) and (b)] with regard to participation by presbyters in the consecration of bishops and instructs its delegates to present that advice as representing the opinion of the Council asked for in Res. 19 of the Committee of November 1930.

It has also been suggested that arrangement should be made by the Joint Committee for holding retreats in the various parts of the field at which the whole Scheme for union could be carefully considered and in which a beginning could be made of the enjoyment of greater spiritual fellowship among the clergy and members of the various Churches.

Another matter to be dealt with by the Joint Committee will be that of Publications, for it is felt by the Continuation Committee that there is need for the publication of literature in all the Vernaculars for wide distribution among all the members of the Churches.

Whether it will be possible in this meeting to consider plans for further drafting of the constitution of the Church and for provision for the organization necessary in the Church after union remains to be seen. An old subject not dealt with so far, though brought before the Committee several times, is the division of the territory into diocesan areas and also the question of the financial implications of union. Perhaps sub-committees can be appointed on these subjects to report at another meeting of the Joint Committee to be held in the not too far distant future.

It will be realised from the above that the four days assigned to the meeting will be quite insufficient for the careful consideration of all these matters and for any final conclusions on them. It will also be evident that the Committee in its own power cannot dream of finding solutions to all these difficulties. But the Committee has faith to believe that power will be given it to do that which is necessary at this time and with all the members of the three Churches uniting in prayer for divine leadership for this meeting we can look forward to an advance that shall be in accordance with the Will of God.

The Lord's Supper

A question that is now being carefully considered by the Continuation Committee of the Joint Committee on Union is that of the method by which the Lord's Supper shall be celebrated at the forthcoming meeting of the Joint Committee in June. There have been celebrations of the Lord's Supper celebrated at former meetings of the Joint Committee. When the Committee met in Madras in June, 1921, the Bishop of Madras (Dr. Whitehead) and the Bishop of Dornakal celebrated in the Chapel of the Women's Christian College and all members of the Joint Committee were invited to be present. Likewise at the 7th meeting of the Joint Committee held in Bangalore in June, 1928, a daily celebration by clergy of the Anglican Church was conducted in the Chapel of the United Theological College, and all members of the Joint Committee were made welcome to these celebrations.

Now, however, since the Episcopal Synod of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, has said that 'though the Synod is unable formally to endorse the procedure asked for, because it is one on which the Church of this province has not yet reached a common mind, a majority of the Synod is unwilling to limit the liberty of the delegates in this matter or to call in question the action of any who feels impelled in view of the agreement already reached and in confident expectation that full agreement will be reached, to join in the Lord's Supper celebrated by ministers of the other uniting Churches at meetings of the Joint Committee and retreats organized directly by it', there will be an opportunity for the Free Church representatives as well as for the representatives of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon to celebrate the Holy Communion to which all members of the Committee will be invited.

The members of the Continuation Committee are very anxious that a way shall be found to carry on these celebrations so that every member of the Joint Committee will be able to be present and partake of the Lord's Supper at that time.

There can be no question but that this celebration of the Lord's Supper at the time of the Committee meeting is another expression of the deep spiritual fellowship that has been manifest in the meetings of the Joint Committee. In fact it is only a natural step forward that the members of this Committee, having enjoyed such spiritual fellowship in the past, should desire to come together at the Lord's Table at these meetings. Though the Free Church representatives have greatly appreciated the welcome they have received to attend the celebrations by their Episcopal brethren, naturally neither they, nor the representatives of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, have been satisfied with these celebrations. No fellowship can be perfect unless it is mutual and consequently all have felt the need of a forward step.

We do not believe, however, that this step should be interpreted in any other way than that it is a step forward in spiritual fellowship. Neither doctrine, nor history, nor practical considerations should be allowed to mar this fellowship. God has spoken to the members of the Committee in their former meetings. He has led those in authority to open the door to a still greater fellowship and nothing should be said or done by any member of the Joint Committee, or by those not members of that Committee, to mar this fellowship.

We should also remember that this step forward in fellowship is a step forward toward union. Coming together at the Lord's Table in this way should mean new consecration on the part of every member of the Joint Committee to the cause of Union and he should go forth from the enjoyment of this rich spiritual fellowship of the meeting to try to bring that same spiritual fellowship to the members of the Church at

large who cannot come to the Joint Committee meetings. It has been truly said that the Councils of our Churches lag behind the Joint Committee, and that the individual Churches lag far behind the Councils, and that the members of the village congregations have still scarcely heard of the movement toward union. Consequently the few who are privileged to enjoy the fellowship of the Joint Committee meetings should consecrate themselves unto the utmost to give to the others something of the privileges that they have enjoyed and to make known everywhere on all occasions the joy and blessedness of such fellowship, for, as has been said before, the fellowship that is enjoyed by the Joint Committee at these times should become the rich possession of the whole of the uniting bodies when we come together into one Church. The spiritual fellowship of the Joint Committee meetings is a promise and a pledge from the Holy Spirit Himself of what He will do for the whole Church when it is again united into one Body.

Retreats

One of the matters to be considered by the Joint Committee at its next meeting is the question of the organization and carrying on of retreats in the various parts of the areas covered by the three uniting Churches. Something has been done along this line and meetings have already been held in Pasumalai, Palamcottah, Madras and other places where especially the ministers of the various Churches have come together to discuss the 'Proposed Scheme'. Something further, however, is necessary. We strongly hold that no group should consider the provisions of the Scheme by itself, for no Free Churchman can fully interpret the mind of an Episcopalian nor can an Episcopalian fully interpret the mind of a Free Churchman. But they should get together in Christian love and talk over their differences as well as their agreements and by thus conferring together and fellowshiping together they are far more likely to understand each other's minds and to receive rich blessings from each other, than if they each remain within their own enclosures and try to discuss the 'Proposed Scheme' by themselves.

What is perhaps most needed is the spiritual approach to one another. In the past we have differed widely on external matters and therefore have not come close together on spiritual things. Could we realise the spiritual unity that already exists we should perhaps be able to overcome many of the external differences that divide us. These external differences are so manifest to the eye and to the ear and to the mind that we seldom penetrate beyond them. Could we so penetrate into the minds and hearts of the brethren in the other Churches, we should find much of spiritual unity with us. Hence it becomes necessary that members and clergy of the

various Churches should get together for few days, especially for spiritual fellowship. Bishop Azariah has said in another connection, 'Let us each give to the other the very best that we have in order that we may receive from each other a rich, spiritual blessing'. That applies both to our thought of the Sacraments and fellowships, as well as to many phases of practical Christian life. Let us draw close together in prayer and worship and meditation and God will reveal the better way that will lead us not only into a physical union in one organization but into a real spiritual unity that will make all the Church the Body of Christ and the instrument of winning the world to obedience to Him.

Church Union in North India

We are very glad indeed to publish in this number the report of the Joint Council of the United Church of Northern India, the Methodist Episcopal Church in Southern Asia, and the Baptist Communion associated with the Baptist Missionary Society, which was held at Allahabad, December 2nd to 4th, 1931. This is an experiment in Church Union which differs radically from that of the present United Church in Northern India, or the United Church of South India and also from the proposed union of the Episcopal, Wesleyan and United Churches in South India. It is, however, a movement in the right direction for it brings together into one body three groups of Churches that have hitherto been separated, and presents new and novel aspects of the problem of union.

The fact that Baptist Churches, who hold the Congregational system of Church government, can unite in this fellowship is in itself very significant for they not only recognise the usefulness of a central organization but they also are willing to place their experience with reference to the Sacrament of Baptism at the service of this united Church, which reveals a great principle of the Kingdom of God, viz., that those who have learnt something of the nature of that Kingdom should be willing even at the seeming sacrifice of life itself to make their experience of service to the wider Church.

Another problem in this union is that of the Methodist Episcopal Church which enjoys at present full corporate and organic union with the Methodist Episcopal Church around the world. Every fourth year it sends representatives to the Quadrennial Conference of that Church and these delegates together with delegates from all other conference areas deliberate together concerning the affairs of their whole Church and determine what the policy and work of that Church shall be. The special problem in this North India Union will be in trying to relate the United Church of Northern India, which is an independent autonomous Church with no official governing body outside of India, with the Baptist

Churches, which are congregational in their organisation, and the Methodist Episcopal Church, which is organically connected with a governing body in America. All those interested in the question of Church Union will follow this movement with the deepest interest believing that ultimately it will lead to the full, organic union of the Church of Christ which is the final goal of all Church Union Movements.

Articles

The Present Situation in the Syrian Church in Travancore

Without entering into a detailed history of the Syrian Church it is proposed in this article to deal only with those portions of it which will serve to throw light on the present-day problems of the Church.

The tradition, popular among the Syrians, attributes the origin of the Church to St. Thomas, the Apostle ('India and the Apostle Thomas'—Medlycott). There are other traditions which ascribe the first beginnings to S. Bartholomew (Eusebius), to Thomas of Cana 'Eastern Church'—(Stanley), to Thomas, a Manichæan (Dr. Burnell), to Ante-Nestorian Missionaries ('Lesser Eastern Churches'—Fortescue), and to Nestorian Missionaries ('Protestant Dictionary'—Margoliouth). We see from these that the history of the Church is rather uncertain until the arrival of the Portuguese in India. Whatever that history may be, I think we may take either Dr. Buchanan or the Rev. Howard as true for the period immediately before the Portuguese occupation of the country. Dr. Buchanan who visited Travancore early in the 19th century suggests that the Jacobites had established connections with the Syrian Church long before the arrival of the Portuguese; while the Rev. Howard would substitute 'Nestorians' for 'Jacobites'.

Soon after the establishment of the Portuguese power in India the Roman Church began to show great interest in the Syrian Church with the result that in 1599 it came under the Roman hierarchical system. But in 1653 a considerable section of the Syrians threw off the Roman yoke and organised themselves into an independent Church. In their anxiety to secure the validity of their orders from an Oriental Church of recognised standing the Syrians appealed to various Churches in the Near East to help them at this moment of crisis ('The Anglican Church in

Travancore and Cochin'—Hunt). The Jacobite Church in Antioch responded to this appeal, and one of their bishops, Mar Gregorius, risked the perils of the sea, and the dangers from an hostile government, and came to Travancore and consecrated the Syrian Archdeacon as Bishop Mar Thoma I.

From Mar Thoma I (1665) to Mar Mathew Athanasius (1876) there were thirteen Metropolitans who guided the destinies of a united non-Roman Syrian Church. Among them seven accepted their orders from foreign Jacobite prelates, and six from their own Indian predecessors. The last of them, Mar Mathew Athanasius, received his consecration at the hands of the Jacobite Patriarch, and on this ground he ousted the then ruling Metropolitan who had had his consecration from a local bishop, and against whom petitions of complaints had gone to the Patriarch. Mar Mathew Athanasius while a young man had come under the influence of the C. M. S. Missionaries in Travancore, and was for some time a student in their school in Madras. After he became the Metropolitan he introduced some reforms which were strongly resented by the more orthodox section of the Church. On representations from this party the Patriarch consecrated a rival to Mar Athanasius in the person of Mar Dionysius V, and later himself came to Travancore. He was so strongly influenced by Mar Dionysius that he excommunicated Mar Athanasius and set up Mar Dionysius in his place. After this the Patriarch assembled his section of the Church (the orthodox party) at a place called Mulamthuruthi in 1876, and gave a constitution to the Church, which is still the only written constitution in the Jacobite Syrian Church in Travancore, though it is seldom adhered to as a whole. The important items in the constitution are:—

1. 'An Association of the whole race should be formed, and called the Syrian Christian association of which our present Holy Father and his successors should be the patrons and the ruling Metran (bishop), the President.

2. Whereas it would be difficult for all of them jointly to carry on the affairs, a chief committee composed of eight priests and sixteen laymen of the first class with the ruling Metran for President should be formed.

3. As it would be difficult for all of them (the chief committee) jointly to conduct and carry on all litigations generally arising as to religious and social matters the Presidentshall be the person who should have the power to carry on all such.....'

The documents in its preamble states, 'we have been called together here in this synod by His Holiness Maran Mar Ignatius Peter III, Patriarch, the chief authority in the Apostolic Throne of Antioch, and the Holy Father of us, the Jacobite Syrians of Malankara and we have heard the reasons explained to us.....'

A year after this assembly Mar Mathew Athanasius died (1877). But while he lived he disregarded the excommunication of the Patriarch, and consecrated his cousin as Mar Thomas Athanasius to carry on his work. As the direct successor of Mar Mathew, Mar Thomas Athanasius had possession of the Church property. But Mar Dionysius V claimed

the property, and filed a suit in the district court in 1879. The property was claimed on the following grounds:—

'Whereas the Seminary at Kottayam.....has been under the control, and in the possession of the Metropolitan from time to time existing under the authority of the Holy Patriarch of Antioch, the Chief Preceptor of the said Syrian Christians and whereas Mar Thanansiushad departed this life, and whereas after that the first defendant (Mar Thomas Athanasius) is illegally retaining possession of all the property belonging to the said seminary.....and whereas since owing to the annulling of the dignity of the said Athanasius, and inasmuch as he is dead.....the said seminary properties should have been without any demur handed over to the plaintiff.....

The suit was carried on for several years in three courts, and in 1889 the High Court gave its final decision in favour of Mar Dionysius, and Mar Thomas Athanasius had to hand over the property.

Mar Athanasius then organised his section of the Church afresh, having neither property nor income. He achieved this with success, and this Church which he built up under the guidance of God, and true to the traditions which his father Abraham Malpan, and his cousin Mar Mathew Athanasius had left him, is the Church now known as the Mar Thoma Syrian Church. It claims to be 'the original body restored to its early apostolic purity', though to the Jacobites 'she is a schism from the Jacobite Church'. The Mar Thoma Church is an autonomous body, her head being the Metropolitan elected by the people.

To continue the history of the successful party, Mar Dionysius secured the property, but there were points in the judgment which made peace in the Church impossible. The judgment made the authority of the Patriarch permanent over the Church, and it further declared that the Metropolitan of the Jacobite Church should be an Indian who should be elected by the people and consecrated by the Patriarch himself or with his sanction only. This meant that when the Patriarch and the people disagreed about a candidate the Church would virtually be without a head who could administer her affairs legally. Mar Dionysius V died in 1909, and in the same year Mar Geevarughese Dionysius VI was installed as Metropolitan by the Patriarch Mar Abdulla, with the full approval of the Church.

But matters were not to rest here. Soon differences arose between the Patriarch and the Metropolitan which brought the former on a visit to Travancore in 1910, and as on the previous occasion trouble arose. This time it was not on doctrines or faith, but on the nature of the authority of the Patriarch over the Church.

After protracted negotiations the Patriarch excommunicated the Metropolitan in 1911 and set up Mar Kurilos in his place. Both parties sought the aid of the law courts to decide their claims on the Church property. In 1923—the litigation dragged on for twelve years—the High Court decided in favour of the Patriarch, endorsing the excommunication

the Metropolitan; but curiously enough the same Court in 1928 revised their decision, and set aside the excommunication as invalid on the ground that the Patriarch had not taken all the facts into consideration before arriving at a decision, and that his procedure was wrong. This second judgment restored the possession of the property to Mar Dionysius, as the legal Metropolitan of the Jacobite Church, though the Patriarch no longer recognised him as such.

If this was expected to bring peace, the Church was rudely disappointed. One litigation followed another, and the life of the Church was continuously disturbed by the two parties coming into open conflict. The Patriarch's party still considered Mar Dionysius as an excommunicated bishop.

In the meanwhile the party of Mar Dionysius created a new dignity in their section of the Church. There was a deposed Patriarch in Turkey who had been a rival to Mar Abdulla (the Patriarch who excommunicated Mar Dionysius VI), and the Dionysian party invited this deposed Patriarch from Syria, and he came and consecrated one of the suffragan Bishops of Mar Dionysius as the *Catholicos of the East*, in 1913, thereby reviving, they say, the ancient office of the Catholicate of the East, which used to have its headquarters at Ctesiphon, and which was in communion with the Jacobite Church in Antioch and Syria. Needless to say, the Patriarch Mar Abdulla, and later his successor Mar Elias, not only refused to recognise the Catholicos, but also doubted the validity of his consecration. In 1930, the greatest supporter of Mar Dionysius, and one of the foremost leaders of the party, Mar Ivanios, suddenly went over to the Roman Church, which act stunned the Church for a time.

In 1923 Mar Dionysius in his old age, undertook the long journey to Syria to put before the Patriarch personally the *impasse* in the Syrian Church in Malabar, and to implore him to help in solving the difficulties of the situation. He spent a fairly long time with the Patriarch, who received him kindly. It is not known what transpired between the Patriarch and the Metropolitan, but on the return of Mar Dionysius to India the Patriarch sent with him a Syrian Bishop, Mar Julius, who it was said, was entrusted with certain papers said to be the order for the withdrawal of the excommunication of Mar Dionysius on his fulfilment of certain conditions in India. No accurate information on these matters has been made available to the Church. But after their arrival here there was disagreement between Mar Dionysius and Mar Julius, and whatever be the reasons for disagreeing, the papers entrusted to Mar Julius were not made public. And so this step also in the cause of a settlement was a failure.

Torn by internal divisions, and beset from without, the Church was in a deplorable condition. It was about this time that Lord Irwin, then

Viceroy, visited Travancore. With his keen interest in the Christian Church, and his characteristic generosity of mind, he offered to render what help he could to heal the divisions of the Jacobite Church. Accordingly he invited the Patriarch, Mar Elias, the successor of Mar Abdulla, to visit Travancore. Accepting the invitation, the Patriarch arrived in Delhi early in 1931, and held consultation with the Viceroy before coming to Travancore. Lord Irwin also secured the help of two eminent Anglican divines, the late Bishop Gore, and Bishop Foss Westcott, the Anglican Metropolitan in India. It is to be deeply regretted that these negotiations ended in nothing, and the Patriarch moved on to Alwaye, Travancore.

Soon after his arrival in Travancore, feelings more friendly than had hitherto seemed to exist between the Patriarch and Mar Dionysius showed themselves, and he recalled the excommunication of Mar Dionysius. This raised great hopes in the minds of the people as to a speedy and amicable settlement of the split, but what it really did was to create a fresh difficulty. Although Mar Dionysius was restored to his original standing as Metropolitan, the Catholicos and the Bishops who supported him were outside this recognition, at least as far as the Patriarch and his party were concerned. This was a complication of the situation. Mar Dionysius was now the proper Metropolitan, but the Catholicos whom he had helped to install, and whom he was bound to support was left out. Many interviews and consultations were held to ease the tension of the situation, but every effort ended in disappointment and failure.

In spite of everything it was the steadfast hope of many, both within and without the Jacobite Church, that a peaceful and honourable settlement would be arrived at before the Patriarch left the shores of India, and perhaps it would have been so, but in the midst of all hopes and fears, the Patriarch died suddenly of heart failure on the 13th of February, 1932.

This unexpected calamity has brought all negotiations between the two parties in the Jacobite Church to a standstill. What the future holds it is not easy to predict. It is to be expected that a new Patriarch will soon be consecrated in Syria. What his attitude to the situation here will be no one can tell. Mar Dionysius and his section want a Church that is practically autonomous, although in spiritual communion with Antioch; but the Patriarch's section will not part with the authority that they have secured by the decision of the High Court. At the same time they appear to be willing to allow a certain degree of freedom in the internal administration of the Church. This can be gathered from a document that was submitted to the Dionysius party by a deputation from the Patriarch's party, as a basis for further negotiations. But the proposals were rejected by Mar Dionysius. The differences in outlook are so serious, and the spirit of bitterness and opposition have increased with time rather

than decreased, that a peaceful settlement seems almost impossible under the present circumstances.

If one may judge from the past, the natural course would be to turn to the law courts again. One of the main things that stand in the way of a free and open discussion is the question of the possession of the property. If either party would decide to leave this subject alone, the basis of further negotiations can be lifted to a higher plane. This will not be easy, but may not help be got on this point in considering the events that took place 50 years ago when one section of the Church passed through almost a similar experience, and had to forego all their property, and thus was set free under God's over-ruling to turn more fully to the spiritual development of their Church? One believes that it was this loss of their material resources that proved to be the real making of the Mar Thoma Church.

Under the new situation that has arisen with the death of Mar Ignatius Elias, Prince Patriarch, the possibility of co-operation between the Dionysian section of the Jacobite Church and the Mar Thoma Church is being openly, though yet, informally, discussed. It has to be stated that after their separation, fifty years ago, these two Churches developed along different lines, the Jacobite Church along sacramentarian lines, and the Mar Thoma Church coming under low Church evangelical influence. In both developments the Anglican Church has been the predominating influence. The early C.M.S. missionaries who belonged to the evangelical section of the Anglican Church contributed largely towards determining the doctrinal position of the Mar Thoma Church, while the members of the Oxford Mission Brotherhood in Bengal, who belong to the Anglo-Catholic section of the Anglican Communion, are helping the Dionysian section in the spiritual side of their work. If the Anglo-Catholics and the Evangelicals can belong to the same Anglican Communion, use same liturgy, own the same head, and can sit together at the same synods and conferences, it is difficult to see why better understanding and union cannot be brought about between the Jacobite and the Mar Thoma Churches. There is a third, though a small, section, known as the Church of Thozhiyoor, in British Malabar. It was founded in 1772 by one Metran Cyril, who had been consecrated by a foreign Jacobite Bishop, Mar Gregorius. In its teachings this Church has leaning towards the Jacobites, while it is really in communion with the Mar Thoma Church. This Church is also to be considered in any scheme for union.

The chief points to be emphasised are :—

1. Mutual recognition of Orders,
2. Acceptance of the Nicene Creed.
3. The Apostolic Succession.
4. Recognition of the Seven Sacraments.

One cannot see difficulties with regard to the first two points, and the third also might with qualifications be found acceptable. There are bound to be differences of opinion with regard to the recognition of the Seven Sacraments; but in view of the great need for better understanding, and the call for co-operation throughout the Christian Churches, an agreement may be arrived at even here, if the whole subject of union be approached by both Churches in the spirit of reconciliation and with an overwhelming sense of the need for such union.

In view of the present strained relations between the Patriarch's section and the Dionysian party the question may be asked whether the former are to be left out of union proposals. On gathers that the two parties still hope for a settlement with each other.

If mention has not been made of the C.M.S. Church in Travancore in the matter of union it is only because they are already in negotiation with the South India United Church for union, and the Syrian Churches await with interest to know the outcome of these negotiations.

K. K. KURUVILLA,
KOTTAYAM.

What is Separation?

In the July number of *Church Union News and Views* the Bishop of Madras has dealt in a helpful manner with some of the difficulties experienced by different people in accepting the Scheme of Union. With most of what he says I am in agreement, but I am unable to regard as satisfactory his attempt to justify the attitude of the Lambeth Conference towards intercommunion.

It will be remembered that the District Synod of the Wesleyan Church pleaded strongly that the existing restriction in this matter be withdrawn, and urged that it regarded such restriction as one of the greatest barriers to the organic union which is desired. The same feeling was expressed some years ago in England by the representatives of the Free Churches who had been in consultation with the representatives of the Anglican Church after the Lambeth Conference of 1920, and it was a great disappointment to many that the Conference of 1930 decided that intercommunion could not precede, but must only follow, the accomplishment of organic union.

In his attempt to defend the attitude of the Conference the Bishop says: 'Anything which can possibly give the impression that a small company of persons can ordain in the name of the church from which they are organically separated is fraught with peril to the cause of union'. The soundness of this argument may be questioned, for there have been cases where a Church, by excommunicating some of its best members, or by imposing on such members conditions which their loyalty to Christ made it impossible to accept, has forced them into separation. Can we blame such if, with all due solemnity, they ordain to the ministry such of their number as seem to them, after earnest seeking of the mind of the Spirit, to have the qualifications for this form of service? They do not, indeed, 'ordain in the name of the Church from which they have originally separated', but they regard themselves as still part of the Church universal, and in that name they ordain.

Even, however, if we were to admit the soundness of the Bishop's statement, we should still have to ask whether either the Wesleyan Church or the South India United Church is rightly described in the sentence quoted, as a small company of persons organically separated from a Church. Leaving to some Wesleyan minister the task of stating the position of his Church let me deal with the other Church concerned. Without dwelling on the fact that it can hardly be called small I pass to the question of separation. It is true that it is organically separated from other Churches, whether the Church of Rome, the Church of England, or the United Church of Northern India. It is not true that it *has* separated itself from any one of these, or from any other Church in Christendom. As its name indicates it has come into being not by separation but by union. The groups of Christians which had come into existence as the result of God's blessing on the work of different missions, that is, of different Churches in the west, felt that it mattered little or nothing to them whether the Gospel had come to them from America or from Switzerland, or whether it had been proclaimed by Presbyterians or Congregationalists. They accordingly sought, and found, a basis of union.

It may be said, however, that while this frees the members of the Church from personal blame, the Churches through whose ministrations they became Christians were separated bodies. But this requires careful examination. The first union accomplished in South India was between the churches of the United Free Church of Scotland and American Arcot Missions, the latter being the representative in India of the Reformed Church in America, which in turn was the American branch of the Reformed Church of Holland. The Churches of Scotland and of Holland never separated from the Church of England, but only from the Church of Rome. The same may be said of the Malabar Church, which came

into the union later, representing the Reformed Church of Switzerland and the Lutheran Church of Germany. In a sense it may be said that these are separated Churches, since they found it necessary to renounce the Roman obedience, and were indeed, in some cases, under Papal excommunication. But should not the same be said of the Church of England? I cannot stop here to quote authorities, but it seems to me to have been clearly proved by Anglican scholars that at the time of the Reformation, and for about a century afterwards, the Church of England regarded itself as a branch of the Reformed Church, and was actually in communion with other branches, including, among others, the very Church of Holland to which the Arcot Mission traces its origin, and also the Church of Scotland. The fact that the Church of England retained Episcopacy, while the other Reformed Churches replaced it by what they believed to be the more primitive rule of presbyters, was not at that time regarded as a bar to intercommunion.

The case of the other elements in the South India United Church is rather different. While neither the London Missionary Society nor the American Board is a denominational society both are now more clearly connected with Congregationalism than with any other denomination, and it may be said that Congregationalists are separatists in the sense that they deliberately left the Church of England. This is true in a sense, but can it reasonably be denied that it was for conscience sake that the Pilgrim Fathers sailed for America, and that those who remained endured persecution? They found separation from the Church of England necessary because that Church was imposing conditions inconsistent with Christian liberty. Can it be said that separation in such circumstances was an act of schism?

Indeed I think we may go a step further and ask the question which I have chosen as the title of this article. What is separation? When the Pope excommunicated Luther, was it not he rather than Luther who was the separatist? The Reformers never regarded themselves as having left the Catholic Church. Their effort was to remove from the Catholic Church a number of corruptions which were obscuring the Gospel and preventing the Church from functioning effectively. To this process of reform the Pope and the majority of the Church of the day objected, and so a separation was inevitable. But surely the guilt of separation lies with those who rejected the call to reform and not with those who accepted it, although the former might retain the outward form of unity while the latter were forced into separation.

And may it not have been so with some other separations? In some cases the seceding body may have been to blame, for human perversity had a good deal to do with many movements for separation. But there have been many cases in which both parties have been to blame, and

other cases in which, as is now generally admitted, the larger body was in the wrong. The truth is, as the bishop admits in another part of the same article, that we are all in separation, and so all ministries are defective in so far at least as this commission is concerned. If so, is it right that some Churches should be described as 'separated' while the same word is not applied to others? Be this as it may, can we reasonably ask the Indian Church to go into the history of the Churches of other lands and try to ascertain which of the separating bodies was right? Indian Christians may be ready to adopt Episcopacy on the ground mentioned by the bishop, namely, that it is more likely that union will be attained by this method than by any other. But they will be more ready to adopt it if the Churches to which they belong are acknowledged by those with which they wish to unite as true branches of Christ's universal Church, and not stigmatised as separated bodies.

J. H. MACLEAN

Edinburgh.

The Value of Episcopacy for the Indian Church

It is well known that many of those persons who subscribed to the proposed South India Scheme of Church Union accepted 'constitutional episcopacy' chiefly as 'a method of church government.' Other practical considerations (such as, that without episcopacy any large union of the Churches would be impossible) were present in their minds; but its acceptance as a method of government indicated that the belief in any special virtue or grace attaching to the person who held the office of bishop was deliberately put on one side.

It is interesting and reassuring to read in the last issue of *Church Union* that the Bishop of Gloucester would not support episcopacy, if it were 'only an interesting piece of antiquarianism'. He believes that it arose ultimately from 'utilitarian considerations which have prevailed in former periods of history.' He gives cogent reasons for his belief that episcopacy has 'extraordinary value for the efficiency of the Church in our own times', and is 'particularly adapted to the needs of a Missionary Church'.

Taking the same position that episcopacy has value for this country, I shall set forth reasons for adopting it as the form of church government suitable for the Indian Church.

There are some who argue that the Church is a spiritual body and that organisation is unnecessary. It is true that spiritual union is primary and organisation secondary; but church history and history generally reveal the fact that movements arising from emotional, idealistic, or spiritual impulses or awakenings speedily decline and disappear unless organised. Any movement of thought or spirit that communicates itself to others must soon organise itself or perish. The Church has had an organisation from its inception. The calling of the Twelve was the first indication of the Christian brotherhood; the call of the Seventy foreshadowed the organisation for propaganda, evangelisation, the proclamation of the good news; the new duties that fell to the Church after Pentecost demanded an elementary organisation for the care of the temporal concerns of the Church, and the Seven were set apart; and from those days to the present time organisations of many kinds for divers purposes have come into being in the Church. Many have fulfilled their purpose and passed out of sight, while others have stood the test of time and change and are with us to-day.

Every organisation is liable to degeneration; and the worst evils have sometimes arisen from the corruption of the best schemes. This is no argument against organisation, but conveys the ever-needed warning that the letter must never be allowed precedence of the spirit. Essentials must abide; organisation must yield to true spiritual urge. Organisation tends to crystallisation, often in a form beautiful, but cold and dead. When form stunts and cripples life, form must give way to life. Every organisation must therefore be elastic. St. Paul uses the allegory of the human body, and a better cannot be found. The body yields to thought, life, spirit. And the body is so wondrously fashioned that it is the happy instrument of manifold thought, intense spiritual life.

Those who know India are familiar with organisations that have stood the tests of pestilence, famine, war, anarchy. The joint family system, rudely shaken by western ways and modern methods, still prevails and provides protection for the whole family and makes poor laws unnecessary. The village *panchayat* survives, though its powers are limited. In many respects it now controls village life. The headman of the village is an ancient institution yet having authority. Caste still holds Indian society in its grip. In many things its hold is relaxing, but in the deeper things of life it governs. There is in India as elsewhere a growing spirit of revolt against all authority, and this makes the settlement of any question more difficult to-day than ever. This again is no argument against organisation, but a clear indication that great care is needed in securing the form of organisation to be adopted.

Another question has to be faced. Can we organise as if no organisation existed? or, Must we take the facts of Church life as they now are in India and build upon them? A Church exists in India. It numbers

some six millions. These are scattered over India, but the largest portion is in the South, where Christian missions began their task. They have varying organisations—some loose, others rigid; some elastic, others hide-bound; some localised, others centralised. Are there any common strands running through these different organisations? Can we lay hold of these and weave them together?

There are first the local churches and thousands of them. The good seed of the kingdom has been scattered, and has sprung up into life in many places under greatly varying conditions. The little company of believers has met together. They have often fashioned themselves after the pattern to which they have been accustomed. They are not ignorant of some form of self-government. Those who have had to supervise such local communities know how hard it is at times to Christianise their practices. It is a gain that there are these companies of Christians who want to manage their own affairs. Here there must be elasticity. No detailed rules can be made that will be applicable to communities in different stages of development. There must be freedom within the limits assigned by the New Testament. This local government—shall it be by the full church meeting; or by representatives—elders, leaders, stewards, deacons, wardens, trustees; or by the minister or catechist in charge? All these methods of government may be necessary at one time or another. There must be a large measure of self-government, but experience teaches that this self-government must follow certain principles and not be open to any hastily-made rule or to the whim of any person who may have influence and authority in the community.

Worship, the administration of the sacraments, marriages, funerals, the Christian way and life must be provided for. Some person or group of persons must have responsibility. While the purpose in every local Church is the same—the growth of the community in grace and in Christian living, the methods of attaining this may greatly vary. The people are in different stages of moral and intellectual development, and the most appropriate method must be adopted, and not one uniform pattern. One person may be best fitted to guide the community. The Indian *panchayat*, or government by five persons, may be more suitable. Here will arise the diaconate, the leaders of the Church—deacon, elder, leader, steward, warden, or any vernacular name that may be chosen to represent these words. Worship and the administration of the sacraments are not so easily regulated where the community is illiterate. If one of the number is competent to conduct worship and is able to teach, he may be ordained for that purpose. It more frequently happens in this country that no qualified person is found in the local church and a person must be sent, either to abide with the flock or to visit it as often as possible. In any case two orders of ministry arise—the minister or presbyter to conduct

worship and administer the sacraments and the deacons or elders to assist in the government of the church. Some organisation of this kind is found in all the churches. This we must utilise and on this we must build.

Practical experience has made it manifest to all the missions and churches that these churches cannot be left to themselves as self-governing and self-sufficient churches. Has this church no relation to similar churches? It has been brought home to all the missions and churches, and often by painful experience, that infant churches, and even those of many years' growth, cannot be left to themselves, if a pure, worthy church is to be developed. The question forces itself upon those who seek the full development of the Christian Church. How are these local churches to be linked together, so that one may help the life and growth of the other? How are they to become part of the Church universal, which is Christ's body?

The churches can be linked together by an organisation, or by a person, or by both. In most churches in South India, in all those that are now consulting together with a view to union, the local church appoints representatives, who meet at some central place, join in spiritual fellowship, discuss questions common to them all, organise for help, spiritual and material, make regulations, and thus declare their unity. These meetings whether called councils, conferences, synods, or some vernacular name, are regularly held and are most valuable, supplying inspiration, guidance, help to the local churches, but the link is more organic than personal and spiritual. Such organisation is found to be very necessary, if not essential, for the growth and development of the churches. But there is something lacking. The personal element is needed for the completion of the organisation. One called of God is required to visit the churches, to bring life and cheer, to manifest the Christian brotherhood, to guide in the carrying out of the organisation, and to be the personal factor in linking the churches together. In some churches one is chosen to preside at councils and generally to visit as he can the churches, but his term of office is usually short. The father in God, who will remain for a longer season, is what is needed to complete the organisation. He will not be merely the chairman of a synod or council, but a powerful spiritual force as well as the guardian of the constitution of the Church.

At present in the Churches that are seeking union in South India there are synods and councils and one is elected to preside, but often he has little or no influence in the local churches. He has no right of entry to encourage and guide. The Indian is not in love with law or constitution as an abstract thing. He wants to meet the embodiment of the law, one who can declare and enforce it. Continuity of office will greatly help him who is placed over a number of churches. His knowledge grows, his ex-

perience ripens, his administrative power develops, his love for the Church increases, and by his wisdom he makes the organisation more effective. His name matters little. Call him bishop, moderator, president, anything that is generally acceptable. When the word is translated into the vernacular, it will lose most of the connotations connected with the English word. The real father in God is needed in India, not all the feelings and associations that have gathered round that name. He is not the Church, nor is he essential to the Church, but as a deacon or his equivalent is good for the local church, as a minister or priest is well-nigh essential to it, so in binding the churches together the bishop or president is the completion of the organisation. The Church may possibly exist without some such organisation; but if we are to build on the foundations already laid in the Churches of South India, an organisation of the kind outlined here is essential. Deacon, minister or priest, bishop, each has his place and function, and all are co-workers with God in building up His Church and extending His Kingdom.

Many speak and write as if the bishop were the Church, and are afraid that he will gather to himself autocratic powers or methods of administration, but, as the Bishop of Gloucester clearly shows, he is but a part of the organisation, for without ministers and church workers, who have their place in the constitution of the Church, the bishop would be a head without a body. Place the bishop in his right relation to the whole Church, as the chief minister, and you have an officer that will be of untold benefit to the Church in South India.

The servants or ministers of the Church have been chiefly considered in this paper. If these perform their duties with the help of the church courts outlined in the proposed Scheme of Union, there will be an organisation and personnel that will secure freedom, elasticity, order, unity, and provide for the expansion of God's Kingdom. If, in addition, such an organisation will link the South India Church with the Church universal, a further strong reason can be urged for its adoption.

H. GULLIFORD.

How the Proposed Union would Affect the Tinnevely Church

Church Union, as at present suggested by the revised edition of the scheme put forward by the Joint Committee, does not affect the Church in Tinnevely in the same degree that it affects the other uniting bodies or the other dioceses of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon.

The scheme provides for an episcopally-ordained ministry, wherein continuity with historic traditions is sought to be maintained, and, from that point of view, will very favourably commend itself to a church that has been episcopally administered. Moreover, the scheme provides for a constitutional episcopate, where the Bishop, as chief pastor, is not autocratic, but is merely the head of the administration, and is compelled to seek guidance and advice from responsible representative bodies, in which the laity also have a voice. From this point of view, the scheme would merely be a continuation in an enlarged and more representative form of the present Diocesan organisation of Tinnevely, where the Bishop is the constitutional head, with certain disciplinary powers outside the constitution. In the new scheme therefore, the Church in Tinnevely is not likely to feel cut adrift from its past associations, and the transition is likely to be more easy and unobtrusive than it may be to other uniting bodies, who have hitherto not had an episcopal ministry.

Yet again, there is no need for fear that the coming in of large bodies of people from other Churches, into the united Church might swamp the present Church. For one thing, mere numbers would convince anybody, that if there be a swamping at all, the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, with the largest number (3,5,883) has the least cause to fear it. Again the scheme has, with great care, provided against such a result. The object of the scheme is not that one Church should absorb another, but that the three uniting Churches should mean to share in common their best traditions, thereby providing for the united Church a richer and fuller experience than any one Church is, by itself, capable of. Speaking broadly, each of the Churches will gain from association with others without losing anything that has been of value for itself. Each of the three Churches has its own distinctive contributions to make, and to pool these together to the best advantage of the whole Church is the object of the scheme. Order and beauty as seen in the Episcopal Church, the effective discipline and the well-equipped ministry of the laity, as seen in the Wesleyan Church, freedom for the individual, and the presence of a diaconate taking a live share in the work of the Church as seen in the S.I.C.C. will all find a place in the united Church. Such a process of bringing together the best in church life and worship, is certain to have a very wholesome effect even in a Church like that of Tinnevely, which, under the united scheme, may have to exist as a single geographical unit without much opportunity for mingling and contact with the other uniting bodies.

The Diocese of Tinnevely may, for its best advantage, undergo certain geographical changes on the formation of the new Dioceses after the union. Ramanad District, the farthest and also the northernmost part of the Diocese, may be put off and handed over to the new Madura Diocese, by

which the Christians of Ramnad would gain immensely, as they have their entire social, political and religious intercourse with the Madura District. They have at present practically no such connections with Tinnevely. To make up for this loss, the Church in the southern part of the peninsula may be amalgamated with the Tinnevely Diocese, which would tend to strengthen the ties between Tinnevely and the London Mission Church of Nagercoil. There have already been some marriage connections, as well as common customs and the same zeal and enthusiasm for the development of the Church and the propagation of the Gospel. The two Churches, if thus united, will have the glorious prospect of becoming a mighty force, to witness for its Master in the south.

A small portion of the Diocese of Travancore and Cochin may be cut off, and given over to Tinnevely. By a special arrangement of Bishop Moore, Tenmalai is now being ministered to by the clergy of the Surandai Circle in Tinnevely Diocese. The majority of Christians in Tenmalai are from Nallur, Surandai and Nazareth sides; it is also much nearer to Tinnevely than to Travancore and Cochin.

Worship

The Scheme provides for the continuance of worship in accordance with previous custom. It provides for sacraments and provides for the retention of essential parts in the sacramental services. The richness of devotion, deep solemnity and the inexhaustible wealth of adoration, experienced in the Holy Communion Service of the Anglican Church of Tinnevely will, it is earnestly hoped, immensely enrich the Holy Communion Service of the uniting Churches, and will not in the least begin to disappear after the union, as some people expect and fear.

The Church worship could be very profitably enriched by the introduction of more Indian Lyrical music. The Chants, the Lord's Prayer and the Creeds could be rendered with Indian music and we could delightfully have *Devarams* (தேவாரம்) in place of hymns, the tunes of which are simply distorted by the village folk and made quite discordant.

Co-ordination of Missionary Efforts

Large and more representative conventions and conferences would help to remove the feeling of isolation. The free interchange of pulpits would enable us to see the good in each other. A larger outlook would, in its train, bring forth the capacity for better leadership. The Tinnevely Church, though sound from the point of view of support, cannot be said

to be strong from the point of view of leadership. In this matter we would do well to learn lessons of value from the brethren of the other Churches, who have never lacked competent moderators for their Church; while in the Tinnevely Church with its hoary traditions, it is not often easy to find a chairman for the Church Council, and we are being treated to the poor spectacle of a very nearly self-supporting Church, needing to draw upon its missionary staff for a chairman.

The younger Church of Travancore Diocese has its own Indian Archdeacon, while in Tinnevely Church even the very name of Archdeacon is still unknown to many. Tinnevely 'which has exported the most valuable product, the first Indian Bishop', in the words of late Rev. Henry Schaffter, and which has supplied leaders in Church, education and other walks of life, to Churches outside the Diocese, makes a poor spectacle when it lacks leadership within its own area.

In conclusion, I would like to add that after the union of the Churches and consequent formation of new Dioceses a glorious future seems to dawn upon the Churches of South India, for the mighty awakening of the spiritual forces of the Church and its irresistible testimony to the heathen world around, Tinnevely taking a leading part in every endeavour to adorn the Bride for the coming of the Bridegroom.

JOHN SAMUEL,
Nallur.

Laymen's Conference on Proposed Scheme of Church Union

Trivandrum, January 14th and 15th, 1932

In opening the conference the Rev. R. H. Eastaff drew attention to the fact that the South India scheme was regarded as the most promising proposal so far made towards the union of Christendom and that the whole world was looking to South India for a lead and said that the responsibility of the Travancore Church Council was immense since it comprised half the membership of the S.I.U.C. He also drew attention to the fact that the Joint Committee was far ahead of the Assembly in the Union Movement, the Assembly ahead of the Councils and the Councils ahead of the

local congregations, and desired the co-operation of the members of the conference for a systematic visitation of the congregations to enlighten the people about the matter.

I. The case for Union, the need and the difficulties.

In the morning session, Mr. T. A. Thomas introduced the subject. He said that union would tend to greater strength for the Church and the community internally and externally, would remove a great stumbling block to enquirers and converts who are puzzled at denominational differences and would minister to administrative efficiency and facilitate the establishment of strong central institutions. The consummation of Union in South India was likely to have a profound and world-wide influence in the cause of union. We are already united in the fundamentals, such as belief in the one Christ, in salvation, in one hope.

As regards difficulties, he said the harmonising of the distinctive elements of Episcopacy, Presbyterianism and Congregationalism presented serious obstacles. From the standpoint of the Congregationalists the insistence on the Historic Episcopate with all its sacerdotal implications and even on the Creeds was not acceptable. On the whole, the Anglican Church sacrificed little, while the sacrifices demanded of other denominations are out of all proportion.

In the course of the discussion it was said that South India was not in a position to lead in the union of Christendom and that the scheme itself had been promoted and drafted by western leaders and that the vast majority of people were ignorant of its issues.

It was not advisable to look at the problem of Church Union from the point of view of administrative or institutional efficiency which are only incidental to present unnecessary organisations, but the aim ought to be to evolve a system that would conduce to the promotion of Christianity in the country in general. The conception of a National Church embodied in the scheme was largely a political offspring of the Reformation which did not lie along the line of Indian genius. What was needed at the present time from the Indian standpoint was not an aggregation of the centralising tendencies of ecclesiastical authority but de-centralisation into smaller units.

The discussion generally centred round the differences between federation and organic union and the predominant view was in favour of the former, though it was pointed out that from the Anglican point of view such a federal union was unacceptable.

It was also pointed out with much emphasis by the Chairman that the chief aim of all union should be the promotion of deeper and wider fellowship among Christians.

II. The Historic Episcopate and the functions of the bishop.

In the afternoon Mr. A. Gunamony introduced the subject. He pointed out from the history of the South Indian Church Union Movement that only episcopacy in a constitutional form was originally accepted for the sake of union and it was not then anticipated that the Historic Episcopate with all its sacerdotal implications would be incorporated into the scheme in the later stage.

By referring to various provisions in the scheme he pointed out that the idea usually associated with the Historic Episcopate was kept clearly in view throughout and if a transitional irregularity was tolerated it was in the hope that at the end of thirty years the process of 'reunion' would be accomplished. He concluded by saying that the functions of the bishop ought to be accepted as an administrative office for general superintendency only.

The trend of discussion was opposed to the Historic Episcopate with its implications. But, it was also stated that the scheme stood for comprehension of the principles of different denominations and it was not possible to impose the principles of any one denomination in a general attempt at union. It was pointed out that union might be accomplished either on the basis of comprehension, on which the Church of England may be said to be based, or on the main essentials on which all are agreed. The former method would mean on the part of the Free Churches approval of things which they hold to be antagonistic to religion. Hence, it was desirable to build the Church on the essentials alone. The view was also expressed that the scheme was objectionable not only for what it contained but also for things which it did not contain and that there are no safeguards preventing the introduction of practices which some of the uniting churches were opposed to.

III. The ministry, ordained and lay.

At the morning session of the 15th January, Mr. A. Zachariah led the discussion. He examined the different conceptions of the Church and of the Ministry. He emphasised the Congregational principles and practice and went to the extent of saying that even in some of our practices, such as the celebration of the Sacrament and Ordination there were vestiges of sacerdotalism. He was for fully conserving the principle of spiritual autonomy of the individual and of local congregations. He also said that it was not desirable for the sake of union to sacrifice Christian principles which had been secured at great cost in the past and he urged that we should abstain from returning to things which, in order to throw away, we

have suffered. He repudiated the arguments in favour of Episcopacy by stating that our District Chairmen, though not called bishops, were practically filling the place occupied by the bishops in the Anglican Church, and that our early church prospered very well under our old missionaries who were more or less bishops. He drew attention to the curtailment in the scheme of the privileges for ministry enjoyed by the laity at present. He feared that, in the course of another thirty years, a generation would grow up with a strange outlook upon God and His saving grace.

Through the imposition of sacerdotal and ritualistic elements of the scheme, the lay ministry contemplated in the scheme was quite different from what obtains at present amongst us, as laymen are required to pass through a regular form of authorisation and appointment. He concluded by saying that while we loved our neighbours we should be careful not to pull down our fences.

In the discussion much emphasis was laid upon the development of voluntary lay preaching which was an important feature of Wesleyan Methodism. Some speakers thought that the treatment of the subject was one-sided and that there were elements of value in the Anglican organisation also which could be incorporated to our benefit so that it might also enrich our spiritual life. With regard to ordination, different practices prevailed in Congregational churches. In England only about half of the ordinations in the Congregational churches were effected by the laying on of hands and in some cases even ordination was dispensed with altogether. In Travancore even the L.M.S. Christians had somewhat sacerdotal ideas regarding ordination and ministers. In England even Communion is often celebrated by unordained men especially in country places where ministers were not available.

There was some discussion as to the unworthiness of a minister celebrating the Sacrament as against the Anglican view that the Sacrament was not vitiated by an unworthy celebrant. It was contended that the character and piety of the celebrant went a great way to enhance the sanctity and efficacy of the Sacrament while his unworthiness might seriously endanger the spiritual atmosphere. One of the speakers held the view that there was already a good deal in common between the S.I.U.C. and the Church of England and said that if we could only introduce a little more of the Anglican elements into the S.I.U.C. it was possible to effect union in the larger interests, spiritual, social and political. He deprecated the tendency of the discussions which indicated that we were even going back upon the S.I.U.C. principles in the pursuit of our own Congregational views and the general spirit of suspicion against the Church of England and thought that the scheme should be accepted as an honest attempt at a solution of the problem. It was pointed out, however,

that it was the very honesty and devotion of the particular denominations to their own principles that caused difficulty which ought not to be treated as trifling. Commenting upon the leanings towards Anglicanism on the part of some of the members one of the speakers said that all denominations were valuable not only for their own sake but for the sake of other denominations as well. The different denominations were like the different colours of the spectrum, complementary and supplementary to each other, and the enrichment of the whole consists in the loyalty of each denomination to its own principles coupled with the spirit of toleration.

One of the points brought into relief in the course of the discussion was the intimate relationship which at present exists in our churches between the pastor and the congregation, which would be seriously marred by the adoption of the present proposals regarding the calling, appointment, and control of the ministry.

IV. The life of the Church after Union, its relation to other Churches and its future.

The subject was introduced by Rev. J. A. Jacob. Mr. Jacob held the view that Union was desirable for the enrichment and the deepening of the spiritual life and the merits of the scheme should be decided on this issue. In his opinion, denominationalism in the Church was on the same footing as communalism in politics and just as it was necessary to outgrow communalism, denominationalism should also be superseded by a common Church which shall be a spiritual home for all Christians. He said that each denomination could make its own contribution to the general life of the United Church and that a Travancore Diocese could very well have a distinctive tendency and there would be no need to sacrifice its cherished principles, while other dioceses could similarly make Wesleyan or other contributions according to the composition of their respective predominant membership. But, in coming to details, he said there were difficulties in the relationship with other churches now in communion with the S.I.U.C. The scheme did not follow the principle embodied in the foreword to the effect that the object should always be to retain and enlarge communion with all churches.

With regard to the various attempts to effect equality of the ministry of episcopal and non-episcopal ministers he drew attention to the observation of the late Mr. Paul Daniel that we stood today exactly where we were twelve years ago and that the Church of England was still holding the view that the non-episcopal ministry was of an inferior order and any interim irregularity that might be allowed were only in the interest of an ultimate

unification on strictly Anglican lines. Even Intercommunion within the United Church was somewhat limited and in Intercelebration the present Nonconformist ministers would be at a very serious disadvantage and be unrecognised by the Anglican membership. Though there were difficulties they were not insurmountable. The Indian Church should be one and we should have the privilege of a child which should be allowed to think out its own problems and arrive at its own conclusions, and here, he said, the scheme needed a good deal of alteration and amendment.

In the course of the discussion it was pointed out that since the scheme aimed at a give-and-take policy between the different denominations, it could not conserve the different distinctive contributions of the denominations but could only bring almost a uniform system and practice. There was a good deal of discussion about the inconsistency between the avowed principle of the freedom of worship and the attempt to evolve different forms of service and the preparation of a common prayer-book and even a detailed directory of the Communion Service at the very early stages.

Attention was drawn to the fact that a simple ecclesiastical organisation would easily come under the sway of political influences which would seriously mar the spiritual power and potentiality of the Church itself. In case union was consummated on the proposed lines there was danger of secessions even to such non-Christian movements as the Brahmo Samaj which were not definitely antagonistic to Christian principles.

It was also stated that the problem of church organisation should be faced from the side of church reform and evangelisation and for this purpose it was necessary to lay emphasis on fundamentals and the spiritual vitality of the membership.

At the close of the conference it was suggested that another conference of a similar nature might be held in the near future to which all the L.M.S. pastors should be invited and when a few representative Anglican and Wesleyan leaders might be asked to explain their position with regard to the scheme.

Mr. D. M. DEVASAHAYAM, B.A., B.D.

Mr. A. GUNAMONY, M.A., B.L.

Mr. T. A. THOMAS, B.A.

Findings Committee.

'Catholic' Principles in the S. I. Union

I was a bit concerned at the terms in which the Metropolitan of India, etc., urged the Diocese of Colombo to come into the united Church of S. India Scheme. He spoke as if the 'Catholic' element in the initiative scene (as compared with the Evangelical and Liberal) were 'strikingly weak' in the (present) prospective composition of the future united Church. I know that the Anglican 'Evangelical' element is more numerous; but I have the impression that the consideration shown to 'Catholic' principles, as represented by the existing minority, is adequate in fairness to the fundamental principle of the Union, namely, mutual regard for conscience, where this *would conflict* on the lines of uniformity rather than permitted freedom of variety in usages. As you know, I have always felt strongly that Section III of the existing Draft (when 'finally drafted for definitive adoption' in an agreed form which I think ought to be yet more considerate of non-Anglican conscience in the Sacramental and Ministerial parts of III (A)) ought to be made more explicitly 'the *Governing Principles*' of the final constitution and as such *unalterable* by the Church's subsequent action: since the *effect* of the initial union *cannot be undone later*, and so no breach of *original understanding* would be just. And the broad principles there laid down, especially as interpreted by Section II and the 'Foreword' (which should remain *historical preambles* or appendices for showing the exact meaning of Section III) are such that any pressure from a fresh quarter (as would be probable from the Colombo Diocese) would be in danger of disturbing seriously the delicate balance already reached by those who have long been *working together* for such unity. Therefore, if the Metropolitan's appeal is earnestly taken up at the February meeting of the (Anglican) General Council, I hope that its members on the Joint Committee will be made aware that it must be on the basis of *full acceptance* of the *Basis* as above defined; else these will almost certainly be a serious detente on the non-Anglican side and a set-back to the Scheme altogether. I feel more and more, the more I gather from all sources as to the Indian mentality, that the distinctively 'Catholic' usages should be kept as far as possible only permissive or *optional* for the particular congregation (in the last resort) and not 'imposed' on any involuntarily by the decisions of larger units (or rather majorities in them). Anything like *legalism* in religious usages, especially those suggesting *ex opera operato* ideas as to the Grace of God should not receive *positive* support least of all in an India such as seems to be developing in the political and social spheres. 'Personality' and 'Conscience' must be fostered in Church as well as State.

VERNON BARTLET.

Episcopacy and Reunion: A Suggestion

W. MACHIN

(From the Indian Witness)

It is quite clear that for a reunion that is to include the episcopal Churches, there must be some form of episcopacy in the united Church. At the Delhi Round Table Conference of 1930 this was shown to be the general opinion, for in the 'Basis for Negotiation' adopted occurs the statement that there should be in the united Church 'superintendents or bishops.' To exclude the episcopal Churches would be very greatly to nullify the value of any reunion. Nevertheless there are serious difficulties in the initiation of the episcopate in a united Church.

In South India the scheme provides for a method of uniting an episcopal Church with non-episcopal Churches. That method has been in essentials accepted by the three negotiating Churches. The writer belongs to one of these, the Wesleyan Methodist Church, and personally sees no objection to the method, especially with the safeguards against sacerdotalism that are now being included in the scheme. But in South India the difficulty of uniting two episcopal Churches with somewhat different views of episcopacy has not been faced. One of the greatest problems in the union of Churches in India is how to unite the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, to give it its official title, with the Methodist Episcopal Church. Some way ought to be found that will lead to the providing of a spiritual home for those that feel that the new Church must have an episcopate continuous with the ancient, I will not say 'historic,' episcopate from which that of the Anglican group of Churches is derived. At the same time it would be wrong for such people to expect that the Methodist bishops should deny their claim to a valid ministry and a valid episcopate. Moreover, not merely the ministers and people of that Church, but those of all Churches in communion with it, must feel that they cannot be parties to such an expectation, or to views of union, or a scheme of union, that would either tacitly exclude the Methodist Episcopal Church, or would insist on particular conditions of union involving the view that there was anything essential lacking in the Methodist episcopate. It is as a minister of one of these Churches that I write.

A postulate that I should wish to make is that while all orders of the Christian ministry preaching the gospel of Christ, or with a sincere intention administering His sacraments, or exercising oversight in His flock, are valid and shown to be so by the manifest blessing of God on their work, yet in disunion none are completely regular. In other words there are no rights, or at least no full rights, in schism, and schismatics we all are as long as we are not putting forth every effort to reunite the

Church of Christ, and so fulfil His high-priestly prayer for the oneness of those that have believed through His apostles' word. I am myself a minister of the gospel, but my orders, valid though they are, are incomplete, and to some extent irregular, as long as disunion exists. Their validity I cannot deny without sinning against the truth, but their full regularity I dare not claim.

In my view the bishops of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon have a perfectly valid episcopacy, plainly blessed by God in this country, as is that of their fellow-bishops of the Anglican communion elsewhere. Moreover it has the manifest advantage of continuity with an ancient episcopate, an advantage because good things are better for being old, just as bad ones are worse when they are old and long-established. At the same time it appears to me that they have not been consecrated bishops in the whole Church of Christ, or given authority over ministers in other Churches than their own, ministers the validity, if not the regularity, of whose orders they themselves recognize. Similarly I see, as it appears to me, that while the episcopate of the Methodist Episcopal Church is a great and valid episcopate, to the full as valid as that of the Anglican Churches, it also is only a partially regular or complete episcopate. Methodist bishops are bishops in the Church of Christ indeed, as fully bishops in my opinion as any, albeit their episcopate does not directly derive from the ancient episcopate of the Church. Nevertheless their authority only extends to the elders and deacons of their own Church. I believe that they would fully admit this, and that the bishops of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon would admit that their authority was only over the clergy of their own Church.

This being so, I believe that when union has been accepted and, in God's time, the moment for the inauguration of the United Church has come, the first act to establish the episcopate in that Church ought to be that these bishops should mutually consecrate or appoint one another to authority in that episcopal Church in which they have not as yet held it, the Anglican bishops appointing the Methodist bishops to authority in their own Church, and the Methodist bishops appointing or consecrating the Anglican bishops to that authority among the Methodist people that they have hitherto not had. In other words I suggest re-consecration all round.

There would be perhaps some measure of humiliation to both in such an act, just as there would be if one of the Wesleyan Methodist General superintendents, who exercise episcopal functions, though they do not call or consider themselves bishops, were to be consecrated a bishop in the South India United Church. But one of the first requirements in approaching reunion seems to me to be an inward attitude of repentance and humiliation for whatever part we may have had by a harsh, unaccommo-

dating, suspicious or over-critical attitude to others in perpetuating the division of the Church, and for whatever slowness has been ours to perceive the need of reunion.

Most of us Christians brought up in the 'free' Churches do not easily perceive the need for any such act of reconsecration or reappointment as I have suggested. But we shall not be able to provide a spiritual home for all who confess the name of Christ as Incarnate God and Saviour, and wish to unite with their fellow-Christians, if we are not ready to do some things for the sake of some of them that are to us necessary, and it may be even somewhat distasteful. We must not, of course, deny any truth of experience or any spiritual gift by anything we do, but that I do not think I am suggesting. Unless we are ready to sacrifice for the fulfilment of our Lord's unfulfilled prayer 'that they may all be one,' we shall not take any great step towards it. Nor we shall be exhibiting much devotion towards Him in respect of this ideal of His, for whatever may be our view of the authorship of the Fourth Gospel, we must recognize the mind of Christ, I think, in this prayer.

It will be said, 'Our bishops would accept theirs, why not they ours'. Quite so, but if we proceed on those lines, reunion will never come, for it can come only by our bearing with others, and their bearing with us. And may one who feels unreasonableness more in his own party perhaps than in others say that they have much to bear, not less than we, and have shown at least an equal readiness to make sacrifices? I thank God for the Christian brotherliness of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, as well as for that of the other Churches concerned in the negotiations that have already taken place. Methodist theology is generally considered to be Pauline. May I close by remembering that Paul wrote, 'love seeketh not her own', in other words, Love is not concerned to see that she gets her rights?

The Statement of Eucharistic Belief

The value of the Statement of Eucharistic Belief would seem to lie in three directions:—

i. The fact that it is a formula which commends itself to all parties, not only to pronounced Anglo-Catholics such as the officials of the Anglo-Catholic Congress but also to Evangelicals such as the Principal of Wycliffe Hall. Our Lord instituted the Last Supper to be a bond of union between His people; as St. Paul says, 'We being many are one bread;

and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread'. On the same night that He was betrayed He gave His followers a new commandment 'that they should love one another'. And this love was surely meant to be the fruit of their feeding upon the Divine Life of Him who is Love—an outward manifestation of the keeping of that other commandment, 'Do this in remembrance of Me'. But it is one of the ironies of history that the Blessed Sacrament, which was instituted by the goodness of God to be the bond of union, has been, through the sinfulness and hot headedness of man, the hot-bed of discord and controversy. To our shame we have to acknowledge that the Eucharist has been one of the storm centres of Christendom. It must be most entirely in accordance with the Will of Christ that, instead of standing round the table of the Lord to rend one another like wild beasts, Christian men should meet together as brothers in an effort after understanding and love. The philosophy of history would seem to be that the so-called Catholic and Evangelical points of view are permanent elements in the Church of Christ. If this is so it can but be a source of strength and gain to have reached a formula which is acceptable to both.

Secondly, its strength would seem to lie in its insistence upon heavenliness of the rite. In the Holy Communion either Heaven comes down to us or we are lifted up into Heaven. To use a phrase of St. Paul, we enter 'the heavenlies'. Upon this the authors of the Statement of Belief strongly insist. 'Our Lord who has promised to abide for ever with His Church is Himself the real Minister in every Sacrament'. And again, 'the Consecration is the Act of the Unseen Lord'. Here can be no charge of magic. It is no miracle worked by a priest. Christ does it all. He presides over every Eucharist. His presence is dominant throughout. It is the Church of Christ entering into the Heavenly Places where He is and sharing in the perpetual outpouring of His Life, which is His Love:—

- (a) Its out-pouring Man-wards. Receiving from Him the Divine Life which shall make them such as He desires them to be.
- (b) Its out pouring God-wards. Joining in the perpetual offering of His perfect Manhood, for man's sake, to the Father which is the sacrifice begun on Calvary and continued ever since in Heaven. There is no other 'Sacrifice of the Mass'. We do not repeat what happened on Calvary, that we cannot do, but we share in it.

Thirdly, the Statement of Belief is valuable because it acknowledges that the 'Consecration has a real effect'. It is not a form of words devoid of meaning and power. 'The consecrated Elements are, by the Will of God, now charged with a new spiritual significance and purpose, being the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ'. The bread and wine do

not cease to be themselves and become something else. But something is added to them,—the life, the personality of Christ. Life for the body is there in them already. That is why bread and wine nourish us. We cannot see the life. No amount of analysis will bring to light that vital thing in food which nourishes the body and makes a person live. But it is there all the same. And now, after the Consecration, a new and other kind of life is there also. The bread and wine are charged with nourishment for the soul as well as nourishment for the body. Those who feed on them become filled with spiritual life—the Personality of their Risen and Ascended Lord.

Bangalore.

W. ELPHICK.

Clippings

Lower House of Convocation, Province of Canterbury

Admission of Nonconformists to Holy Communion

(From The Church Times of January 29, 1932)

The Lower House reassembled in the Church House to-day, the Prolocutor (Dr. Kidd) presiding. It devoted the greater part of the day to a consideration of resolutions, passed by the Upper House last year and submitted to the Lower House, concerning the admission of Nonconformists to Holy Communion in Anglican churches. The following are the resolutions:—

That this House, having considered Resolution 42 of the Lambeth Conference, is of opinion:

(1) that, so far as it concerns permission for Anglicans to receive the Holy Communion at the hands of Ministers other than those of the Anglican Churches, the Resolution has no application in this Province, inasmuch as the conditions contemplated in it do not exist within the Province;

(2) that, so far as it concerns permission to encourage persons who do not belong to the Anglican Communion to receive the Holy Communion in Anglican Churches in temporary circumstances or on special occasions, the giving or withholding of such permission is in the discretion of the Diocesan Bishop, who should be guided by the following considerations:

(a) Where a baptized communicant member of a church not in communion with our own is cut off by distance from the ministrations of his own church, we recommend that he should be welcomed to Communion. But if such person becomes a habitual communicant over a long period, the claim of the Church to full conformity with its requirements should be pressed upon his conscience.

(b) In school or college chapels where services are conducted according to the rite of the Church of England, members of the society, who, being baptized, have the status of communicant in their own body, may be regarded as falling within the scope of this Resolution.

(c) On special occasions, if and when they arise, where members of other denominations are united with Anglicans in some form of Christian endeavour, and he is satisfied that those concerned are in sympathy with the project of visible and organic Reunion, the Bishop, if requested, may approve the holding of a Corporate Communion according to the Anglican rite, subject to the principles and provisions set forth in Resolution 42 of the Lambeth Conference.

The Dean of Winchester hoped that the Lower House would not be urged to look on the issue before it from the point of view of what was sometimes called a 'gesture'. He thought the only consistent line they could take was that all baptised Christians were members of the Body of Christ. It had to be admitted, not only that the Nonconformist bodies in this country were in schism, but that the whole of the Christian Church was at present in a state of schism. He quoted from pamphlets on the subject issued by the National Church League and the English Church Union. The argument of the first Society was, briefly, that Church-people were merely the stewards or trustees of the Lord's Table. Speaking as one long associated with the English Church Union, he could only regard its pamphlet as a deplorable document. It ought to be possible to set out arguments against the Bishops' proposals avoiding the calculated attitude of seventeenth-century hatred.

The Rev. C. E. Douglas (Southwark), who had placed on the agenda a motion that the Bishops' proposals seemed to be *contra jus commune*, said that the law forbade the parish clergyman to give Communion to any person not confirmed, and until that law was varied, no one could dispense with it.

The Dean of Norwich said that the resolutions seriously affected the present laws of the Church, and the greatest care must be taken in dealing with the merits of the question. A grave situation might be created if the resolutions were agreed to, because they went against statute law as embodied in the Book of Common Prayer, and they would create confusion and raise conscientious objections that would be sincerely held by a large number of priests. He felt strongly that the Lower House ought not to be asked at that stage to agree, but that the matter should be considered by a joint committee of both Houses.

The Rev. E. D. Merritt (London) said that the Bishops would do well to go no further in the matter. He argued that the Lambeth guarding inter-communion, had not contemplated England as a 'special area'. If the Bishops' proposals were accepted, they would give help to few, and would assuredly cause serious controversy and strife at a time when there was a greater measure of unity than in past years. Why stir up strife and disunion all over the country merely in order to deal with rare and unusual cases?

The Dean of Lincoln expressed sympathy with the general spirit and purpose of the Bishops' resolutions. It seemed to him that the first step should always be inter-communion and possibly the last step the exchange of pulpits. What a tragedy, disaster, and cause for the enemies of God to blaspheme it would be if, on the eve of an International Disarmament Conference that might sweep away certain weapons of war, the Church should solemnly decline to abandon the use of her deadly weapon of excommunication in her dealings with other bodies of Christian people.

The Provost of Birmingham (Bishop Hamilton Baynes) said that general interchange of pulpits or general inter-communion tended to arrest the progress of real reunion.

The Archdeacon of Coventry said they must pray to be delivered from an attack of nerves in dealing with the new situation. There seemed to be no real barrier to such action as was contemplated by the Bishops.

Dr. W. J. Sparrow Simpson (Chelmsford) said that the Bishops' proposal was one of those popular, but eminently superficial, attempts to escape from the consequences of division without removing its causes. It was necessary to know on what ground that proposal was based. Modern authorities on Canon Law were of opinion that a Bishop could dispense with the rules of his diocesan synod: but not with the rules of the Church at large.

The Rev. R. J. E. Boggis (Exeter) related how, when he was a young priest in the West of England, with a great jealousy for the observance of the rubrics, there came to his parish an old, retired Congregational minister. There was no Nonconformist church within several miles, and the minister had asked him if he would administer the Holy Communion to him, because he thought he was not long for this world. He (Mr. Boggis) had refused that request; but, looking back, he now recognised that his action had been unkind, uncharitable, and cruel.

The Archdeacon of Newark also recalled a personal incident. When he was vicar of a

village in Derbyshire, a Nonconformist chapel had to close, and the congregation asked if he would give them Communion. He told them Conference, when it passed its resolution to that the rubric forbade it, but he consulted his Bishop, whom he would always revere because he said that, in the circumstances, the request might be granted, and the people became members of his church.

Dr. Darwell Stone (Oxford) recommended the appointment of a Committee to go into the whole question.

Canon Markham (Lincoln) said he was indignant to find the streets placarded with the news: 'The Clergy Challenge the Bishops'. Nothing was further from the truth.

The Master of the Temple was of opinion that the Bishops' resolutions did not throw open all the doors in a reckless way.

The Rev. G. F. Graham-Brown (Oxford) said that a new situation demanded a new policy. Were they to endorse the report in regard to the Old Catholic Church and refuse to stretch out the right hand of fellowship to those who were members of the Church of God?

The House adjourned until Friday morning.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 22.

The House resumed its consideration of the resolution, sent down from the Upper House, concerning the admittance of Nonconformists to Holy Communion.

The Dean of Norwich moved:—

That the debate on the resolution sent down by the Upper House on June 3, 1931, being adjourned by permission of the President, the Lower House requests the Prolocutor to nominate a Committee to consider the resolution and to report at the next group of sessions.

The Dean said that, after what had happened that morning with regard to inter-communion with the Old Catholics, they would be even more anxious than on the day before for unity and accord with their brethren to whatever communion they belonged; but that unity could not be attained in the present group of sessions. They would have to divide on the issue, and there would be two parties in the House. He was most anxious to avoid disunity among themselves. If they merely adjourned the debate till the next group of sessions, he could not see much chance of a greater degree of unity. On the other hand, if a Committee were appointed, representing various points of view they might hope that it would be able to present a reconciled and

unanimous report to which the House could give assent at the next sessions.

Prebendary Harris seconded.

The Dean of Chichester opposed the motion. He could not see why the same guidance should not be afforded to the whole House as it was anticipated would be afforded to a Committee. The matter had already been debated at considerable length, and it was a very simple one. There was no need to go into long historical inquiries as to what was meant by episcopal dispensations. They were merely asked to regularize a practice which had been in existence for a long period. It turned on the question whether the admission of a person, not confirmed, to Holy Communion in certain circumstances was a matter which should rest in the hands of the parish priest, or whether the parish priest should have power to refer the question to his Bishop and leave the final decision with him.

The Provost of Birmingham Cathedral moved the further consideration of the whole question to the next group of sessions, and the Dean of Chichester seconded.

Canon Scott-Moncrieff (Derby) supported the motion for the appointment of a Committee. The debate on the previous day had turned on two reports by the English Church Union and the National Church League, and he did not think it was in accord with the dignity of the House to proceed in that way.

The Archdeacon of Hampstead also desired a Committee; but the Dean of Winchester wished to keep the debate in the House on the ground that a fox that went to earth was an intolerable nuisance.

The Provost of Birmingham's proposal was put to the House, and was rejected by 74 votes to 23.

Canon A. A. Mayhew (St. Albans) hoped that the Committee would not be composed of theological, historical, or archaeological experts. If it were composed of 'central' people, there was a chance that a unanimous report would be produced.

The Dean of Norwich's motion was put to the vote, and carried by a considerable majority.

The Prolocutor nominated the following members to serve on the committee: The Prolocutor (Convener), Canon A. G. Robinson, Canon Hellins, the Bishop of Barking, the Provost of Birmingham, the Dean of Norwich, the Dean of Winchester, the Dean of Lincoln, the Archdeacon of Coventry, Dr. Darwell Stone, Dr. S. L. Brown, Canon Guy Rogers, Canon Markham, Prebendary Hinde, the Rev. E. D. Merritt, and Canon G. W. Briggs.

S. I. Church Union Scheme and the Episcopal Synod

(From the *Madras Diocesan Magazine*)

The following has been received for publication in the *Magazine* from the Superior of the Oxford Mission to Calcutta, who was a member of the Joint Committee on Union:—

OXFORD MISSION,
42, CORNWALLIS STREET,
Calcutta.

To

THE MEMBERS OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL OF
THE CHURCH OF THE PROVINCE OF INDIA,
BURMA AND CEYLON.

In view of the great perplexity and distress of mind caused to many members of the Church by the reply of the Episcopal Synod to the suggestion made by the representatives of the S.I.U.C. and Wesleyan Church that 'in the meetings of the Joint Committee and in conferences directly organized by it the members should be at liberty to unite in Communion Services presided over by ministers of one or other of the uniting Churches,' the advice of theologians in England was sought and I venture to send you a copy of their reply.

T. E. T. SHORE,
*Superior,
Oxford Mission Brotherhood of the
Epiphany.*

KEBLE COLLEGE, OXFORD,
20th March, 1932.

THE REVEREND THE FATHER SUPERIOR,
OXFORD MISSION TO CALCUTTA

DEAR FATHER SHORE,

At your request, we have considered the published 'Reply' of the Synod of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon to the proposal of the S.I.U. and Wesleyan Churches that 'in the meetings of the Joint Committee and in conferences directly organised by it, the members should be at liberty to unite in Communion Services presided over by ministers of one or other of the uniting Churches.'

In our opinion this Reply affords grounds for the gravest possible anxiety, for the following reasons:—

(i) The proposed procedure goes far beyond anything sanctioned or suggested even by Resolution 42 of the Lambeth Conference of 1930. The Synod characterizes the proposal as no more than 'an enjoyment by anticipation of the results of a formally achieved union.' This, however, is extremely misleading. The Lambeth Resolution No. 40 (b) states definitely that the united Church will ultimately be established 'on a basis of . . . episcopal order'—a basis which precludes the celebration of the Lord's Supper by persons

not episcopally ordained. The proposal, if adopted, would anticipate not the 'results of a formally achieved union,' but the irregularities of the intervening period which must elapse before union is finally achieved.

- (ii) The proposal appears to emanate from persons who are not members of the Anglican Communion, and there is no evidence that it has behind it any considerable weight of Anglican opinion.
- (iii) The Synod by stating in advance that it will not 'question the action of any (Anglicans) who feel impelled . . . to join in the Lord's Supper celebrated by ministers of the other uniting Churches,' has given tacit encouragement to the proposed procedure.
- (iv) The proposed procedure constitutes in principle a clear violation of Catholic order. It sets the ministrations of persons not episcopally ordained on the same footing as those of duly ordained priests; and thereby implies that the spiritual life of the Christian Church as a whole can be adequately nourished and permanently maintained apart from sacraments administered (in the words of the Lambeth Encyclical, 1930), within 'the traditional framework of faith and order which characterised the whole Church for so many centuries.' (Report, page 26).

We notice with deep thankfulness that the Synod declares itself 'unable formally to endorse' this violation of Catholic principle. But we feel bound to observe that, if, at any stage, such a violation were formally endorsed, we should no longer be in a position to advise an Anglican priest to continue to minister in the Church of India.

We are,

Yours very sincerely,

H. L. GOUDGE, *Régius Professor of Divinity,*
Oxford.

B. J. KIDD, *Warden of Keble College,*
Oxford.

K. E. KIRK, *Fellow of Trinity College,*
Oxford.

W. B. O'BRIEN, *Father Superior-General,*
S.S.J.E.

F. W. PULLER, S.S.J.E.

DARWELL STONE, *Principal of Pusey House,*
Oxford.

N. P. WILLIAMS, *Lady Margaret Professor
of Divinity,* Oxford.

It has never been suggested that if the negotiating Churches come together into a formal union, then full unity has been automatically reached. From that time, however, there will have arisen a state of things where-in various bodies can grow into a real unity in

time. During that period of growth into real unity, many anomalies must be accepted, the chief of which will be that *non-episcopally ordained ministers will be recognised as ministers of the sacraments in the United Church.* However, the Scheme guards tender consciences and former Anglicans will not be forced to use such ministries when receiving the Holy Communion. Gradually, all the ministers of the United Church will be episcopally ordained and then it is presumed *all members of the United Church will, with a good conscience, be able to communicate at the hands of all the ministers of the United Church.* Although it is true that the United Church will ultimately be established 'on the basis of..... Episcopal Order', this will not immediately supply 'a basis which precludes the celebration of the Lord's Supper by persons not episcopally ordained'.

After a formal union has been reached and before the ultimate complete unity is perfected, former Anglicans must *have the liberty to communicate at the hands of any ministers of the United Church (episcopally ordained or otherwise) if they feel impelled to do so: but there will be no compulsion.*

The present resolution, if adopted, will therefore be definitely an anticipation of the 'results of a formally achieved union', since our mem-

bers no the Joint Committee will be *at liberty to join in a Communion service, which many think irregular; but they will not be compelled to do so.* Also it would anticipate the 'irregularities of the intervening period which must elapse before union is finally achieved'.

The signatories are trying to contest two positions which are really identical.

If they do join in such a Communion, it will be because they 'feel impelled, in view of the agreement already reached and in confident expectation that full agreement will be attained to join in the Lord's Supper celebrated by ministers of the other uniting Churches at meetings of the Joint Committee and Retreats organized directly by it'. (Synod's resolution).

As regards para (iv) it is hardly correct to say that such a proposal, if adopted, 'implies that the spiritual life of the Christian Church as a whole can be adequately nourished and permanently maintained apart from sacraments administered.....within the traditional framework of Faith and Order which characterise the whole Church for so many centuries'. This proposal only deals with special exceptional occasions, and is not intended to destroy, in any way, our dependence on the sacramental system we have been used to, and to which the Union Scheme looks as one definite goal.—Ed., M.D.M.

OUTSTANDING VALUES!

PRECISION THERMOMETERS

"SURGICO"



BEST MAKE

Made of special *Normal-Glass*, triangular magnifying lenses and clear, distinct and easily read black figures. Self-registering in $\frac{1}{2}$ minute. 'Shakedown' easily. Passed the most exacting and severe tests. Sold with a printed guarantee as to *accuracy and reliability*. Used in several hospitals in India. In Nickel case with pocket clip, As. 1-4 each. Rs. 10 per dozen. In screwed coloured Vulcanite case, with pocket clip, Re. 1-4 each, Re. 14-4 per dozen.



"SR" Adhesive Plasters. Zinc Oxide. In airtight containers. Very useful and lasting quality. Pocket or trunk size. For cuts, wounds, etc. In spools 5 yards long.

Width, 1 1 2 3 ins.
Rs. 9 12 15 21 per doz.

Hospital size Rolls. 12 inches wide, 5 yards long.
Re. 1-8 each.

Physician or Household size Rolls. One yard long, 7 inches wide, Re. 1-8 each.

Write for Literature.

Goodrich Hot Water Bottles. Best for the Indian climate. Long-lasting, durable and fast-selling.

2 quarts Rs. 3-4 each.
3 " Rs. 3-8 "

Do. With Douche Combined, complete, 2 quarts, Rs. 5-8 each.

Infants' or Face Hot Water Bottles, one pint, Rs. 2-4 each.

Goodrich special list sent free. It contains many useful rubber products for home, dispensary and hospital use.



Leading House for Surgical Instruments & Hospital Requisites

Manufacturers of Hernia Trusses, Abdominal Belts and Orthopedic Appliances,

BOMBAY SURGICAL CO., New Church Road, BOMBAY, 4.

Telegrams: "SURGICO".

Telephone No. 41936.

THOS. COOK & SON, LTD.

(INCORPORATED IN ENGLAND.)

IN CO-OPERATION WITH WAGONS=LITS CO.

Head Office :—Berkeley Street, Piccadilly, LONDON, W. I.

PASSAGES engaged by all lines at same fares as charged by Steamship Companies. Holders of COOK'S tickets met at all ports. Outward passages engaged and tickets supplied from any part of the World to India. Usual reductions obtained for Missionaries, Railway Officials, Families, etc.

BAGGAGE received, stored and forwarded. Cargo shipped to all parts of the World at current rates. Inward consignments such as Hardware, Piecegoods, Machinery, Stores, etc., for Messes and Clubs, cleared and forwarded at special rates. Insurances of all kinds effected on Baggage, Cargo, Livestock, Mess Property, etc.

THE ORIENTAL TRAVELLERS' GAZETTE containing sailing dates and fares of all steamers, together with invaluable information for travellers, sent post free on application.

GOVERNMENT CERTIFICATES accepted. No deposit required.

THOS. COOK & SON (BANKERS), LTD.

(INCORPORATED IN ENGLAND.)

Head Office :—Berkeley Street, Piccadilly, LONDON, W. I.

CURRENT AND FIXED DEPOSIT ACCOUNTS opened. Interest allowed. Pay and Pensions collected, Periodical remittances made at current rates. Insurances premia paid.

LETTERS OF CREDIT AND TRAVELLERS' CHEQUES issued, encashable throughout the World.

DRAFTS granted and TELEGRAPHIC TRANSFERS effected on all principal towns.

INSURANCE Life, Accident, Fire, Burglary, effected. Prospectus on application.

300 Offices throughout the World.

**EASTERN OFFICES: BAGHDAD, BOMBAY, CALCUTTA,
COLOMBO, DELHI, MADRAS, RANGOON, SIMLA, and
SINGAPORE.**

Madras Office 1-35 Mount Road.

Telegraphic Address: "COUPON"